

Page 9 of 11
Application No. 10/820,832
Amendment B

reasons.

For instance, recall that claim 1 requires (a) receiving a signal from the detected device; (b) detecting a device profile in the signal; and (c) the device profile contains a preference for a product or a service. According to the cited portions of Jokinen set out above, the preference is contained in database 36, which is part of mobile network 30. (Jokinen Fig. 1). Claim 1, in contrast, requires the device profile (that contains the preference) to be in the signal. A signal from a detected device (claim 1) is quite different than information contained in mobile network database 36 (Jokinen).

Examining this difference in more detail, it is understood that Jokinen simply uses a preference that is stored in a mobile network database 36 (Fig. 1). Jokinen therefore discloses, at best, detecting a preference in network database 36. This is completely different than detecting a device profile in the signal from the detected device, as required by claim 1. This is because network database 36 is not the detected device.

Another distinction relates to the claimed “device profile contains . . . a geographical boundary.” The portions of Jokinen relied upon by the Office Action refer to distribution of electronic coupons by transmitting in a limited transmission area. (Jokinen col. 5, lines 33-38). Assuming *arguendo* that the limited transmission area of Jokinen somehow discloses a “geographical boundary,” claim 1 remains distinguishable since this transmission area has nothing to do with the claimed “device profile.” The cited portion of Jokinen states nothing in the way of “receiving a signal,” “detecting a device profile in the signal,” or that the “device profile contains . . . a geographical boundary.”

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that Jokinen fails to teach or suggest several elements recited in claim 1, and therefore this claim is believed to be patentable. Independent claims 16 and 23 recite similar language to claim 1, and thus, are believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those set out with regard to claim 1. The rejected dependent claims 2-5, 7-15, and 24-28 are believed to be patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependence on patentable claims 1, 16, and 23.

Page 10 of 11
Application No. 10/820,832
Amendment B

Claims 17 and 29

Independent claim 17 is directed toward a method that requires “receiving a location parameter from one of the plurality of devices for a scheduled meeting among participants individually associated with one of the plurality of devices.” Applicant submits that Jokinen fails to teach at least this feature of claim 17 for the following reasons.

Regarding the meeting element, the Office Action refers to the following passage of Jokinen:

Another way of limiting the distribution of electronic coupons by location is to transmit electronic coupons in a limited transmission area such as with a short range communication link like Bluetooth within or near a store so that only people within the range of the communication link receive the offer. (Jokinen col. 5, lines 33-38) (emphasis added).

This passage simply describes a scheme for transmitting coupons in a limited transmission area. The example given is that users who are near a store and within range of the transmission link receive the offer. The cited passage provides nothing in the way of receiving location parameters from a device associated with the Bluetooth communication link. Jokinen is equally silent with regard to a “scheduled meeting” among such devices. Jokinen has nothing to do with a scheduled meeting, and places an emphasis on distributing coupons to mobile terminals that match criteria set by advertisers. This is completely different than claim 17 which requires “receiving location parameters from one of the plurality of devices for a scheduled meeting.” In other words, Jokinen is concerned with criteria set by advertisers, whereas claim 17 relates to “receiving location parameters from one of the plurality of devices.” The advertisers of Jokinen are not the same thing as the devices of claim 17.

Applicant therefore submits that Jokinen fails to teach or suggest several elements recited in independent claim 17, and therefore this claim is believed to be patentable. Independent claim 29 recites similar language to claim 17, and thus, is believed to be patentable for reasons similar to those set out with regard to claim 17. The rejected dependent claims 18-22 are believed to be patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on claim 17.

Page 11 of 11
Application No. 10/820,832
Amendment B

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jokinen in view of Official Notice.

Applicant has demonstrated above that Jokinen does not teach or suggest various features recited in claim 17. Applicant further submits that none of the other references remedy any of the identified deficiencies of Jokinen. In addition, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the position of the Office Action with regard to Official Notice. Accordingly, dependent claims 20-21 are believed to be patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on patentable independent claim 17.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the above amendments and remarks place all of the pending claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

By way of this amendment, Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Thomas F. Lebens at (805) 541-2800 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.


Date: December 1, 2008

Address all correspondence to:
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
120 So. LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600
Chicago, IL 60603

Direct telephone inquiries to:
Thomas F. Lebens
(805) 541-2800
San Luis Obispo, California Office of
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY

Respectfully submitted,

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY


Jeffrey J. Lotspeich
Registration No. 45,737
Attorney for Applicant